



**AGENDA
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL, RENO CITY COUNCIL, NORTH LAS VEGAS
CITY COUNCIL AND THE HENDERSON CITY COUNCIL
JANUARY 15, 2003**

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES:

The meeting was held at the Grant Sawyer Government Building, Room 4401, 555 E. Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

PRESENT from CITY OF LAS VEGAS: MAYOR OSCAR B. GOODMAN and COUNCIL MEMBERS MICHAEL McDONALD (arrived at 12:12 p.m.), LARRY BROWN (excused from 12:00 p.m. until 12:19 p.m.), MICHAEL MACK and LAWRENCE WEEKLY

Excused: COUNCILMAN GARY REESE and COUNCILWOMAN LYNETTE-BOGGS McDONALD

Also Present: CITY CLERK BARBARA JO RONEMUS

PRESENT from CITY OF HENDERSON: MAYOR JAMES B. GIBSON, COUNCIL MEMBERS ARTHUR "ANDY" HAFEN, STEVEN KIRK and AMANDA CYPHERS

Excused: COUNCILMAN JACK CLARK

Also Present: CITY CLERK MONICA M. SIMMONS

PRESENT from CITY OF RENO: MAYOR ROBERT CASHELL and COUNCIL MEMBERS SHARON ZADRA, JESSICA SFERRAZZA, DWIGHT DORTCH and DAVE AIAZZI

Excused: COUNCIL MEMBERS PIERRE HASCHEFF and TONI HARSH

Also Present: CITY CLERK LYNETTE JONES

City of Las Vegas

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

PRESENT from CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS: COUNCILMAN ROBERT L. ELIASON
and COUNCILWOMAN SHARI BUCK

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(11:35)

1-1

MINUTES:

MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, welcomed everyone to the Special Joint Meeting. This is the first time that representatives from the Cities of Reno, Henderson and North Las Vegas join the City of Las Vegas City Council in a Joint Special Meeting to discuss issues that will be discussed at the next Legislative session, issues that are very important to all the Municipalities throughout the State. Municipalities will only be healthy if all the Cities share ideas and work together.

(11:35 – 11:36)

1-10

MAYOR GOODMAN led the audience in the Pledge.

(11:36 – 11:37)

1-54

MAYOR GOODMAN called to order the Special Joint Meeting of the City of Las Vegas City Council and invited the Cities of Reno and Henderson to do the same. MAYOR CASHELL, City of Reno, and MAYOR GIBSON, City of Henderson, called to order the Special Joint Meeting of the City of Las Vegas City Council. The City of North Las Vegas was unable to attend this meeting because they had their scheduled City Council meeting. However, he mentioned that COUNCILMAN ROBERT L. ELIASON and COUNCILWOMAN SHARI BUCK from the City of North Las Vegas were present.

(11:37 – 11:39)

1-104

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

DIRECTOR: NIEL PEZZILLO

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Presentation of City of Reno legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

None

1. Submitted at Special Joint Meeting – City of Reno 2003 Legislative Program

MOTION:

IAZZI – Motion to support all Bill Drafts as presented by the City of Henderson and the City of Las Vegas, including the Urban Consortium, seconded by MAYOR CASHELL – UNANIMOUS with COUNCILMEN PIERRE HASCHEFF and TONI HARSH excused

NOTE: COUNCILMAN AIAZZI indicated that the City of Reno was prepared to make a motion to support the Bill Draft Proposals as presented.

NOTE: MAYOR GIBSON, City of Henderson, noted that they want to be supportive, but they have not had an opportunity to further discuss and understand the various Bill Draft Proposals. They will take action, if it will be meaningful, after having had a chance to understand the BDR'S. He preferred to defer the motion and indicated that he looks forward to being able to support the other cities.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 1 – Presentation of City of Reno legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES:

NICOLE LABOLEY, Legislative Relations Manager, City of Reno, indicated that the City of Reno submitted three Bill Draft Requests (BDR) for consideration in the upcoming legislative session. The first BDR would require Reno voters in Washoe County to vote either to consolidate City services or create a Reno County. On November 5th the voters elected to seek consolidation of services, but voted down to create a new County. This particular BDR would provide for enabling legislation that would allow cities with a population of 100,000 to 400,000 a process by which they can determine if and how to consolidate services. MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, verified with LEANN McELROY, Chief of Staff, City of Reno, that Washoe County was aware of the ballot question and a committee was established to discuss consolidation.

MS. LABOLEY explained for MAYOR GOODMAN that the ballot questions were written as follows: “Shall the City of Reno seek to consolidate services between Washoe County and the City of Reno” and “Shall the City of Reno seek to create a Reno County.” MAYOR GIBSON, City of Henderson, verified with MS. LABOLEY that this was just a City initiative. Washoe County was given the opportunity to put it on the ballot countywide but elected not to.

MS. LABOLEY discussed with MAYOR GOODMAN that the question of consolidation passed with 72% in favor and the question to create a Reno County failed. There was no public information campaign in support of the ballot questions.

MS. LABOLEY explained that the second BDR addresses the issue of graffiti. The City of Reno is seeking a change on how multiple offenses are penalized. This would allow the judge to obtain a penalty that fits accumulatively on effects of a crime. Rather than treating one instance of graffiti separately, if there were repeat offenders, the damage to the property would be cumulative and could be treated in its entirety as opposed to a single case. It has been their experience that most graffiti defacers often leave markings that clearly identifies who they are. A case could be presented that they have repeatedly caused damage to various facilities and properties.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked whether someone who is charged for multiple acts, would the conviction result in multiple convictions or if under the singular complaint, would it be a conviction of one count. MS. LABOLEY replied that for multiple offenses obtained at one time, the value of the property loss or damage could be accumulated for the purpose of determining the penalty. Rather than charging a \$100 fine, a greater fine or penalty could be levied.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 1 – Presentation of City of Reno legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY, City of Las Vegas, commented that he represents the most mature areas that have the most graffiti abatements. He asked what types of laws are applied in Reno and who is held accountable for these acts. In Southern Nevada, if a youth is caught in the act, the parent is held responsible, which many parents oppose because they feel this law is unfair. He also asked where Reno has the most graffiti. CITY ATTORNEY PATRICIA LYNCH, City of Reno, replied that if the person is under 18, the parents can be held liable for damages, otherwise it can be either prosecuted as a misdemeanor or a gross misdemeanor, depending on the amount of damage. One of the purposes of this BDR is to try to accumulate the misdemeanors so that a higher penalty can be imposed for the smaller crimes. The Reno Municipal Court has very few cases. Most of the cases go through the juvenile justice system or through the District Attorney's Office for the gross misdemeanors. CITY ATTORNEY LYNCH indicated that the graffiti is everywhere, but mostly downtown.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY noted that a lot of man-hours are dedicated to the abatement of graffiti in the City of Las Vegas. He would be interested in seeing the effects of this BDR.

COUNCILMAN DAVE AIAZZI indicated that graffiti in the City of Reno is occurring wherever there is a blank wall. This affects their planning in trying not to have blank walls and do more chain link fences, which is not very attractive either. But mostly, graffiti is found in the downtown and older areas, which is probably true of the City of Las Vegas.

MS. LAMBOLEY explained that the third BDR would allow cities, if they so choose, to grant a special event promoter exclusive rights for an event. Currently, when a special event promoter is looking at hosting an event, they have public safety and financial issues. This bill would allow the promoter to be insured and public safety would not be compromised. Presently, there are exclusivity rights in the Statutes for special event promoters. There are some other services that are listed as being exclusive, should the City so determine.

MS. LAMBOLEY indicated that one additional request has not yet been submitted, but they are looking for a sponsor for a bill that would allow the City Council to send an appeal under the Nuisance Statute to Municipal Court rather than it going to the City Council. With increased enforcement, they are seeing more appeals coming before the City Council, which are time consuming and often require more time to facilitate these appeals.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 1 – Presentation of City of Reno legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, pointed out that the proposed BDR 374 does not indicate the 100,000 to 400,000 size of the City, as it relates to the consolidation of the City of Reno and Washoe County. MS. LAMBOLEY explained that the Bill has not gone through the City of Reno City Council to fill in the blanks of the BDR. It was submitted with both, depending on the result of the voters. The Bill will be brought before the City Council towards the end of the month with the details of what the BDR would look like.

There was no further discussion.

(11:40 – 11:53)

1-162

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

DIRECTOR: NIEL PEZZILLO

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Presentation of City of Henderson legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

None

1. Submitted at Special Joint Meeting – Information about the revision of the Charter of City of Henderson

MINUTES:

TERRI BARBER, Director of Intergovernmental Relations, City of Henderson, indicated that the City of Henderson is seeking to change their Charter to give the City Council the authority to specifically identify positions that will not be covered by Civil Service. Currently, the positions not included in Civil Service are listed in the City Charter and any change to that list requires action through the Legislature. The elimination, modification and creations of positions is an on-going process that is best administered by the City Council on an as-needed basis. This bill will improve city governance by giving the City Council the ability to designate those positions that should not be included in Civil Service without the additional expenditure of time and resources. This bill will provide the flexibility to manage senior management and employees in confidential positions.

COUNCILWOMAN SFERRAZZA, City of Reno, asked if Council's staff is hired through the City Manager or by the City Council. MS. BARBER replied that the City Manager hires Council's staff.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 2 – Presentation of City of Henderson legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

There was no further discussion

(11:53 – 11:56)

1-583

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**DIRECTOR: NIEL PEZZILLO**☐**CONSENT**☒**DISCUSSION****SUBJECT:**

Presentation of City of Las Vegas legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

Fiscal Impact☒**No Impact****Amount:**☐**Budget Funds Available****Dept./Division:**☐**Augmentation Required****Funding Source:****PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:****RECOMMENDATION:****BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

None

1. Submitted at Special Joint Meeting – Proposed Bill Draft Request 2003 Nevada State Legislature

MINUTES:

KAMI DEMPSEY, Manager of Government Relations, City of Las Vegas, outlined two proposed Bill Draft Requests; the Investment in a Redevelopment Area and Collection of Property Liens. She indicated that currently local government officers and employees are barred from acquiring or investing in property within the Redevelopment Area. The proposed bill would allow elected officials, a private citizen who volunteers on an advisory committee, or City employees to invest in a redevelopment area. The bill would limit any benefits an employee or elected official would receive. COUNCILMAN IAZZI, City of Reno, stated that the City of Reno is looking at a similar bill. He asked whether the employees of the Redevelopment Agency would be allowed to invest in property within the Redevelopment Area. MS. DEMPSEY replied in the affirmative.

MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, added that if the leaders and the citizens who participate in the redevelopment process feel that it is worthwhile to put their own money in the area that is being redeveloped, they should be permitted to do so. There was criticism that perhaps some insider

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 3 – Presentation of City of Las Vegas legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

information would lead to an unwarranted profit. But there would have to be full disclosure and elected officials would have to abstain. MAYOR GIBSON, City of Henderson, verified with MS. DEMPSEY that the disclosure for city employees would be similar to the one the elected officials must comply with. MS. DEMPSEY added that it has been requested that any such disclosure would have to be a separate agenda item so that it can be publicly discussed and questioned.

Regarding the second BDR relating to collection of Property Liens, MS. DEMPSEY indicated that currently Clark County has gone from an annual to a semi-annual tax roll. The proposed bill would allow Clark County to include all City of Las Vegas nuisance and dangerous building abatement liens on the semi-annual tax roll. COUNCILMAN AIAZZI, City of Reno, asked if there is a legal difference for changing the language between liens to a special assessment. CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC, City of Las Vegas, replied that that is a little broader but essentially the same thing. The City is trying to ensure that everything is being recorded. The lien runs with the property. COUNCILMAN AIAZZI asked if there is a different way for a special assessment district to be put on the yearly tax roll so that it would not have to be paid each year. Other laws can then kick in where the sale of property can be enforced until the lien is paid. CITY ATTORNEY JERBIC indicated that currently it could not be enforced with a lien.

COUNCILMAN MACK, City of Las Vegas, asked if this would help expedite the process as it relates to abandoned buildings. MS. DEMPSEY replied that it does expedite it because once it is added to the tax lien the City is collecting instead of having to wait until the building is either sold or the property is sold.

(11:56 – 12:02)

1-689

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

DIRECTOR: NIEL PEZZILLO

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Presentation of Nevada League of Cities legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

None

1. Submitted at Joint Meeting – Nevada League of Cities 2003 Nevada Legislative Session
Approved Bill Draft Requests

MINUTES:

MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, indicated that during his State of the City Address he inadvertently forgot to congratulate COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD, City of Las Vegas, on her accomplishments and achievements this past year. Her staff told him that her fondest accomplishment, and the one she is most proud of, is being the President of the Nevada League of Cities.

MARY ANDERSON, Lobbyist, Nevada League of Cities, stated that COUNCILMAN ROD SCHMIDT, City of Sparks, chaired the committee that put together the proposed Bill Draft Requests for Nevada League of Cities. It was a citywide effort and some City of Las Vegas Council members participated as well. These bills went before the League's annual meeting in August and nine BDR came out of that process. She indicated that the 2003 Nevada Legislative Session would be a difficult one. She is aware that President COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked that all the cities have their lobbyists register for the League as well.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 4 – Presentation of Nevada League of Cities legislation and any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

MS. ANDERSON gave an overview of the list of BDRS and submitted a copy for the record. COUNCILMAN MACK, City of Las Vegas, pointed out that skate parks are becoming very popular in Southern Nevada and there is a current cap on liability. He asked that BMX parks be included in BDR#9.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY, City of Las Vegas, asked what type of support would BDR#7 get if it would include larger cities. MS. ANDERSON replied that that particular issue was not discussed when this package went through the League's Executive Board. But it is something that can be brought to the attention of the general membership.

(12:03 – 12:12)

1-927

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**DIRECTOR: NIEL PEZZILLO**☐**CONSENT**☒**DISCUSSION****SUBJECT:**

Presentation of local government financing by the Urban Consortium and any appropriate action or direction to staff

Fiscal Impact☒**No Impact****Amount:**☐**Budget Funds Available****Dept./Division:**☐**Augmentation Required****Funding Source:****PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:****RECOMMENDATION:****BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

None

1. Submitted at Joint Meeting – Nevada Urban Government Consortium information packet

MINUTES:

MARVIN LEAVITT, Executive Director of the Urban Consortium, explained that the Urban Consortium has been put together by the five largest cities in the State: Reno, Sparks, Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas. These cities have similar interests on matters relating to finance and taxation. MR. LEAVITT stated that discussions have been heard that the State is very poor and that local governments are very rich and that can hardly find places to spend all their money. The argument is that local governments get the majority of the property tax and the State gets only 15 cents of property tax. These comments are not true. It is important to discuss how the property taxes are actually divided. Everyone recognizes that the State is facing severe financial difficulties and this is simply an indication of where the cities stand. MR. LEAVITT outlined how schools levy money for operating purposes. This is reflected in a chart within the information packet that he submitted for the record.

The argument that cities get a huge percentage of the property tax is not true. It is important to understand that property tax is not the major source of revenue for local governments. The total percent of the total general fund for the cities that are in the consortium are Henderson with 15%, 18% in Las Vegas, 10% in North Las Vegas, 21.9% in Reno, and 24.26% in Sparks. The average is only around 20% of the total general fund revenue, which comes from property tax.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 5 – Presentation of local government financing by the Urban Consortium any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

That leaves 80% of the total general fund revenue that comes from other sources. The primary source of revenue is very consistent throughout these cities and comes as sales tax and consolidated tax, which is made up of two kinds of sales tax, cigarette and liquor, and what was known as the motor vehicle privilege tax and real property transfer tax. The total revenue coming into local governments, nearly 50% of that total revenue, comes from that one source alone. Therefore, local governments are dependent on the movement of sales tax, which is subject to economic fluctuation depending on the state of the economy.

MR. LEAVITT indicated that in recent years property tax revenues have grown rapidly, but it is also true that population and the service demands have also grown at a rapid pace. For example, the City of Reno, which has the least growth and probably the oldest properties, has actually decreased. The City of Reno had an average per capita assessed valuation of \$14,534 in 1981 and 1982 and only \$12,057 in 2002 and 2003. This affects the property tax.

The huge growth in Henderson has not only affected its size, but it affected the very nature of the community. Henderson went from 65-55 per capita in 1981 and 1982 to \$14,181 now. However, the average growth per year is only 3.74% per year. It would be very difficult to fund the state budget deficit on this 3.74%. Cities go through cycles. There are periods of growth, periods when that growth diminishes and periods where growth may actually decline. Using those numbers, Las Vegas' growth is 1.38%, North Las Vegas is 2.89% and Sparks is .46%. It cannot be said that the assessed valuation is growing so rapidly that these cities ought to be able to give up some of that and fund the deficit at the State level.

MR. LEAVITT mentioned that, because the State has a responsibility to education, which is important, local governments ought to be willing to give up some of their revenues and join with the State in trying to fund education. Education is important, but looking at expenditures from these five cities, over 60% of their general fund goes to public safety. Taking away from public safety to give to education does not necessarily improve the community. Neither can be diminished.

There is a difference between how State and local governments budget. The State budgets every other year and the Legislative body of the State meets every other year. The Legislative bodies of the cities meet every other week. When problems arise, a city has the ability to respond to those problems very quickly, before the deficits get bigger, and revenues can be re-estimated and action can be taken almost immediately. The State has difficulty. The Governor can curtail expenditures, but the legislature of course only meets every other year. They fund schools by so

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 5 – Presentation of local government financing by the Urban Consortium any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

much per student and as their revenues start to decline, since they have a commitment to fund education, as long as that continues to grow, they have a budget problem because they have to fund that immediately. In addition, they have welfare responsibility, and welfare expenditures have an adverse relationship with revenues. As revenues go down, indicating an economic problem in the community, the welfare expenditures go up. Local governments, if they are not able to adjust their expenditure, as they grow, they spread the coverage. These cities have the same number of people handling the bigger area and the same number of employees handling more citizens for the various functions performed. Therefore, even though it does not have such an immediate effect in the long term, the situation is exactly the same as the State when cities are not able to fund that.

MR. LEAVITT concluded that he anticipates that there will be some disputes during the coming Legislative session.

COUNCILMAN AIAZZI, City of Reno, pointed out that city residents also live in the county and his concern is that those residents will be doubled taxed. MR. LEAVITT replied that one of the proposals that has been put forth states that a certain percentage of growth in property tax is allowed. Any growth above that is not going to the State. The problem is that if this is allowed, the same growth is computed at the county level and at the city level. Therefore, city taxpayers pay twice. That raised a legal question. COUNCILMAN AIAZZI stated that if this is the case, his hope is that it will be fought to leave it at the County level.

MAYOR GOODMAN, City of Las Vegas, indicated that he hopes that it will not happen, on behalf of the City of Las Vegas, and he is certain that MAYOR GIBSON, City of Henderson, MAYOR CASHELL, City of Reno, as well as MAYOR MONTANDON, City of North Las Vegas, feel the same. He believes that the reason the City of Las Vegas is financially in halfway decent shape is because the City has been very budget conscious. Even though a hiring freeze has been implemented, services are still being provided to the constituents. People are working harder and longer in order to provide those services under our budget. It would be a terrible shame if the City were punished because it has been fiscally prudent. He asked MR. LEAVITT

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003

Item 5 – Presentation of local government financing by the Urban Consortium any appropriate action or direction to staff

MINUTES – Continued:

that if pressure is brought to bear upon monies used to provide those services, does the City have a choice or must it abide by whatever decision will be made. MR. LEAVITT replied that the Legislature has the final word about how revenue is distributed. But given that, it would seem foolish to take money from the public safety provider and give it to education. Again, it does not improve the community.

MAYOR GOODMAN thanked staff from the different entities for their presentations.

(12:12 – 12:37)

1-1263

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JANUARY 15, 2003

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Items raised under this portion of the City Council Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

MINUTES:

TOM McGOWAN, Las Vegas resident, welcomed the Mayors and City Council members from each government entity. He submitted for the record comments regarding the socio-economic vitality of the State of Nevada.

(12:37 – 12:40)

1-2250

PATRICIA MARTINELLI PRICE, Homeless Advocate, 3212 Redrock, Las Vegas, Nevada, thanked the Mayors and Members of the City Council from the different municipalities that took time to participate in this joint meeting. She stated that out-of-state developers who do not help the City of Las Vegas community should not be allowed to come to Las Vegas. She commented that she would be going to Carson City to lobby on the issue of homeless children, youth and women, who are victims of circumstances. They need to be treated as human beings. Those areas that are infested with crime and drugs need to be cleaned first. Maybe those people selling drugs should be rehabilitated, as well as the mentally challenged. Some people might say that the homeless like to be homeless. Who is happy to be outside in the rain or the heat?

She stated that MAYOR GOODMAN should extend an olive branch to the NFL and show them that Las Vegas is not only about gaming but also about people that care about their community. It should be shown on a national level that Las Vegas is a community with children and grandchildren. All municipalities in the State of Nevada need to come together to make a difference for human beings.

(12:40 – 12:30)

1-2460

City of Las Vegas

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 15, 2003
Citizen Participation

MINUTES – Continued:

NICOLE LAMBOLEY, Legislative Relations Manager, City of Reno, announced that there would be a Southern Nevada Local Government Economic Forum at 1:30 p.m., Casham Field in Room 104. MAYOR GOODMAN invited the City of Reno to join them.

(12:30 – 12:32)

1-2608

COUNCILMAN AIAZZI indicated that the City of Reno was prepared to make a motion to support the Bill Draft Proposals.

(12:32 – 12:46)

1-2636

MAYOR GOODMAN, CITY OF LAS VEGAS, ADJOURNED THE SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL, RENO CITY COUNCIL, NORTH LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND HENDERSON CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS at 12:46 P.M.

MAYOR CASHELL, CITY OF RENO, ADJOURNED THE SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL, RENO CITY COUNCIL, NORTH LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND HENDERSON CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF RENO at 12:46 P.M.

MAYOR GIBSON, CITY OF HENDERSON, ADJOURNED THE SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL, RENO CITY COUNCIL, NORTH LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL AND HENDERSON CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF HENDERSON at 12:46 P.M.